

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 7003 of 1996

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE S.M.SONI and  
MR.JUSTICE Y.B.BHATT

=====

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not?
3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement?
4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder?
5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge?

-----  
UNITED PHOSPHOROUS LTD

Versus

UNION OF INDIA

-----  
Appearance:

MR ASHOK L SHAH for Petitioners  
Mr.H.M.Mehta,Sr.Standing Counsel, with MR KETAN A DAVE  
for Respondents

-----  
CORAM : MR.JUSTICE S.M.SONI and  
MR.JUSTICE Y.B.BHATT

Date of decision: 25/09/96

ORAL JUDGEMENT (per Soni J.)

After the impugned order of 22.3.96, respondent no.2 has given personal hearing to the petitioners on 21.5.96. However, order thereafter is not passed. It is stated at the Bar by Mr.H.M.Mehta, Ld. Senior Standing

Counsel, for the respondents that at that stage of hearing, petitioners were called upon to produce original deed of transfer and respondent no.2 would pass order after perusing and considering the same. Learned Advocate for the petitioners states before the court that they will produce the original deed of transfer and respondent no.2 may retain a copy thereof, if he wants. In view of this state of affair, respondent no.2 may pass necessary orders after perusing the original deed of transfer. However, it is hoped that said order will be a speaking order, if it is adverse to the petitioners. It is also hoped that respondent no.2 will pass necessary orders within two weeks from the date of the production of original deed of transfer. At the time of production of original deed of transfer, the petitioners may be heard, if they have anything to add to the earlier submission. In view of this direction, petition stands disposed of. Notice discharged. No costs.

It is clarified that in view of the further hearing given to the petitioners, the impugned order of 22.3.96 does not remain final one.

----